THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men*" Luke, 2 14.

"*How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth Salvation.*" Isa 52. 7.

VOL. II. SATURDAY, FEB. 26, 1825. NO. 25.

STRICTURES UPON A SERMON ENTITLED "FUTURE REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, THE SUBSTANCE OF A DISCOURSE DELIVERED BEFORE THE NEW-ENGLAND CONFERENCE OF METHODIST MINISTERS, PROVIDENCE JUNE 17, 1823. BY REV. WILBUR FISK. A. M."

Concluded from page 183. No. 23.

2. "Could not God have made man just as happy, *without causing him to suffer at all?*" What shall we do with this question? Mr. F. says, "If you say he could not, you *limit* his power; if you say he has the power, but not the will, you limit his goodness." For the sake of the argument we will, for a moment, admit that the above is correct. What would be the consequences? 1. God has both the power and the will to make man just as happy without causing him to suffer at all, as with all the suffering ever to be endured: whatever God has the *power* and *will* to do, that he doeth; therefore *God has made man happy without any suffering at all!!* 2. If God could have made man just as happy without any suffering, as well as with suffering, then the *aggregate miseries, sufferings* and *woes of the whole human race are totally needless; are perfect cruelties!!*

It is not limiting the divine power to say God cannot perform things absurd, contradictory and unreasonable. We have no hesitation in saying that God could not have made *man* without subjecting him to suffering; and we fully believe that man will be made perfect through sufferings; or will be made more happy in consequence of suffering than he could have been without enduring any misery. God, we think, might have made a race of beings *instead of man*, and he might, for ought we know, have made such beings perfectly and everlastingly happy: but such race of beings would not have been *men*. What we mean therefore, when we say God could not have made man happy without suffering, is this: if instead of man, a race exempted from suffering had been made, that race would not have been *man*. Is this a limitation of divine power? If so, then it would be a limitation of divine power to say, God cannot cause a thing to exist and not exist at the same time.

Mr. F. says, "that God's mercy endureth forever, we must all acknowledge.—But what is or is not consistent with this mercy, God alone must determine." If "God alone must determine" this matter, why does Mr. F. determine that endless misery is consistent with the divine mercy? Again, Mr. F. says, "He (God) has determined it." The inspired Psalmist, in an appeal to God himself, has said, "*Unto thee O God belongeth mercy; for thou renderest to every man according to his works*" No *partiality* in God. He renders to every man according to his works: consequently the final condition of one, will be the condition of all. Mr. F. has now "gone through with the argumentative part" of his subject; we have followed him. Our labor is submitted to the candid of all classes.

Having completed our remarks upon the argumentative parts of Mr. F's. discourse, nothing remains to be done, except to make a few observations concerning his closing address.

Mr. F. says, "the eternity of future rewards and punishments is a subject, which at present, excites among us considerable attention." In this, we agree with Mr. F, We think this great subject *deservedly* excites much attention. Mr. F. says, "the irreligious and prophane, almost *en masse* and with but little examination, are greedily swallowing down the doctrine of immediate happiness or final restoration." All the evidence we have of the truth of this assertion, is, the mere *ipse dixit* of Mr. F. Should we assert that the bigoted, hard-harted, cruel and malevolent, almost *en masse* are greedily swallowing down the doctrine of the endless misery of others, whom they are pleased to call *less righteous* than themselves; and that this abominable doctrine is perfectly congenial with

their feelings: our assertion would prove as much as does that of Mr. F. Mr. F. says, "I do not wish to stir up the spirit of bigotry; but I would excite you to a love of the truth, and to a vindication of it."—If Mr. F.'s brethren would take heed to this exhortation, we should not, so freequently, call upon them *in vain* to vindicate, or relinquish their sentiments. Mr. F. says "your believing or not believing it," (the doctrine of endless misery,) "does not alter the truth. The anxiety manifested and the exertions made to proselyte to the Universal faith, is strong evidence, that its supporters expect the more they bring over to their creed, the stronger will be their system. This however is a mistake. A false system is not the less false, for being embraced by thousands. And a true one, is not the less true because thousands reject it." It is evident to every discerning mind, that the opinions of men cannot alter truth. But Mr. F. has here judged others by a rule, by which he certainly would not wish to be judged himself. Mr. F.'s rule is this. "The anxiety manifested and the exertions made to proselyte to the Universal faith, is *strong evidence*, that its supporters expect the more they bring over to their creed, the stronger will be their system." Let us apply this rule to Mr. F. The exertion he has made in preaching and writing to proselyte to Methodism, "is *strong evidence* that he expects the more he brings over to his creed, *the stronger will be his system!!*" According to Mr. F. therefore, he must cease to labor in the ministry, or be suspected of thinking that the truth of his system depends on the numbers who adopt it!

Mr. F. cautions his brethren against embracing, and warns them against propagating "the doctrine of Universal salvation." For, says he, "if that system be true, there is nothing gained by propagating it. All will be equally safe, at last, whether they believe it or not." Now reader mark Mr. F.'s words, "*if that system be true*, there is nothing gained by propagating it." What! Nothing gained by propagating *truth?*—Then we may as well propagate *falsehood!* It seems almost incredible that a professed preacher of truth should thus publicly declare that a doctrine ought not to be preached, IF TRUE! How much does this fall short of an attempt to vindicate the propriety of preaching *falsehood* or *nothing?* Mr. F. says, "all will be equally safe at last, whether they believe it or not." If Mr. F. had stated this subject fairly, he would have said, all will be equally safe, at last, whether they *now* believe it or not; for Universalism does not save mankind *in unbelief*, but from unbelief—from all impurity. It seems Mr. F. would be better without his religion than with, if he could only be assured, that, without it, he would "*be safe at last.*" He does not therefore love and serve God on account of the excellency and amiableness of his character; but he pretends to love and serve God, because he fears, he awfully fears an endless hell! According to Mr. F.'s own acknowledgement, his religion is a torment to him! We would suggest to this author that he doubtless has on the *yoke of superstition*, which he has mistaken for the yoke of Christ. For Christ says, "My yoke is *easy* and my *burden* is light." Mr. F. says, "Should it be said, it (the belief of Universalism) makes men happier here, I reply what then? This system tells us, temporary suffering is necessary to increase the relish for positive enjoyment. And the apostle speaking of those who will finally be saved, declares that for such their "light affliction, which is for a moment, worketh out a far more exceeding, and eternal weight of glory." To our astonishment and satisfaction too, Mr. F. has stated that Univeralism recoguizes the same principle which is clearly laid down by the apostle! He says, "this system (Universalism) tells us, temporary suffering is necessary to increase the relish for positive enjoyment." What does the apostle say concerning this matter? Mr. F. says, "And the apostle, *speaking of those who will finally be saved*, declares that for such, their "light affliction, which is for a moment, worketh out a far more exceeding, and eternal weight of glory." If Universalism teaches that all our suffering shall result in our greatest good, and if the apostle says, "our light affliction, which is for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory," then the apostle was a Universalist, or taught the same sentiment which Universalists believe. Inasmuch as the apostle lays it down as truth, that "afflictions work out a far more exceeding weight of glory," to those who shall be saved, we would inquire: does Mr. F. think this principle would justify him in inflicting upon himself all possible misery in this life? The fact is, no man in his

senses ever acted in this way. This principle should not be carried so far as to say, *the more temporary misery, the more final happiness*; because this would obligate us to make ourselves as miserable as possible. From the weakness of our nature, we are necessarily subjected to some misery; and the great truth declared by the apostle, was revealed to man to afford him comfort and consolation, to inspire him with confidence in his all-gracious Creator, and prevent his falling into hopeless despair. Any error which leads men to afflict themselves unnecessarily, is most pernicious in its consequences.

Mr. F. says "what if an eternity of woe await the finally impenitent sinner? And this may be true. Who will say he *knows* it is not? Who will say his opinion on this subject is infallible? If none dare assert this, then all must acknowledge that the doctrine of endless punishment may be true. If it may there is danger. And to propagate a contrary sentiment, increases that danger because it destroys caution. This danger becomes, at least probable, by the hitherto unanswered arguments adduced in the foregoing discourse." We trust that Mr. F. will never again assert that his arguments are "*unanswered.*"—But Mr. F. asks "who *knows* it (the doctrine of endless misery) is not true"? In our turn, we ask who *knows* that endless misery is a truth? Who will "dare assert this"? If none dare assert that they *know* endless misery to be true, then according to Mr. F. it *may be false*, and its advocates may have needlessly destroyed the present peace and happiness of millions by preaching the most abominable falsehood that ever chilled with horror the soul of man! Though Mr. F. and every other preacher of eternal misery must acknowledge *they do not know that doctrine to be true*, yet we often hear them speak on the subject as though they did *know something about it!!* Mr. F. *asserts* that to propagate a sentiment contrary to endless misery "destroys caution." But he has not seen fit to furnish us with any *evidence* of the truth of his assertion. Mr. F. says, "In view of this danger, how cautious ought you to be in embracing and spreading a sentiment, which to say the least, *may be false!* And if false, the believing and propagating of it will be attended with an *infinite evil*. And if true, the not spreading of it, will not diminish, but rather increase the positive good." Can we admit the existence of "an infinite evil," without impeaching the character of the moral Ruler of the universe? Certainly not. If *infinite evil* exist, shall we say God is its author? Or shall we say, some finite being, by the exercise of his *limited* powers, has produced an *infinite effect?* Either supposition is most palpably absurd, and totally inadmissible. The unerring wisdom, almighty power and unbounded goodness of God, constitute an immutable barrier against the existence or introduction of an infinite evil.

Mr. F. says, men "*may lose their souls*," by resting secure in the hope of universal salvation. *We* cannot take his assertion as evidence in this case.

Mr. F. says, "You have been led, it may be to favor this system, from the affection you feel for your friends, and especially for your children. You have been asked whether you could endure to have them cast off forever? *W*hether the joys of heaven would be any compensation for the anguish you must feel, to know that your bosom friend, or the fruit of your body was miserable. Thus the sympathies of your nature—these short-sighted sympathies, that were given you, not as a standard by which, to determine there should be no punishment, but to excite you to save yourselves and others from that punishment; these sympathies, I say have been wrung, till in the anguish of your soul, you have overlooked all argument, you have given up your judgment, and resolved it could not, *must not be so.*"—Here Mr. F. admits the abominable nature of the sentiment he advocates, and acknowledges it to be such as to wring the soul with unspeakable anguish! The *gospel* in its nature stands directly opposed to the soul-agonising doctrine of endless torment. St. Luke 2, 10. "*Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people!* In our last quotation from Mr. F. he misrepresents the sentiment of his opponents. He says, the sympathies of our nature were not given us as "a standard by which to determine, *there should be no punishment*" &c. Do Universalists say there will be no punishment; They do not. They fully believe in the doctrine of rewards and punishments, without any partiality. Mr. F. says, the sympathies of our nature were given us to excite us to save ourselves and others from that punishment. Mr. F. rogues that endless punishment is a certain

ty, and that some will assuredly suffer it; still he says, the sympathies of our nature are given us to excite us to save ourselves and others from that punishment. If endless punishment be *certain* to some, how, or by what means can they escape that certainty? *Escape a certainty!* Absurdity simplified!

Mr. F. says, "Do you love your friends? Can you not endure the idea of their being in a dangerous situation? Then be careful how you instil into their minds, or encourage them in the belief of universal salvation." If this sentiment be so dangerous, why has God taught it as with letters of gold in pictures of silver, throughout his word? See Gen. 12th and 22d chapters, Acts chapter 3d. Rom. chapter 4th. Gal. chapter 3d. and Heb. chapter 6th. In the scriptures to which reference has just been made, we find that God has *unconditionally* promised to bless all nations, families and kindreds of the earth, with spiritual blessings in Christ—that he has confirmed that promise by an oath—that there exists no law which can prevent the completion of that promise. After all this, Mr. F. thinks it "*dangerous*" to inculcate the doctrine of universal grace! Though it may not be strictly correct for any human being to say he positively *knows*, (for *faith* is essentially different from *knowledge*) what will be the final condition of mankind; yet if God be immutable, if any reliance can be placed upon the divine word, if the Almighty should ever fulfil his promise voluntarily made, if the oath of Jehovah be any ground of confidence; in short, if there be the least foundation for one gleam of hope to one *sinner* in the universe; then every human being shall be purified from the dross of iniquity, made alive in Christ, reconciled to God, and brought into the enjoyment of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, that fadeth not away for ever! Notwithstanding all this and much more evidence in support of the impartial wisdom and boundless grace of God; Mr. F. is pleased to call this doctrine the "*stalking error of the day!*" May God forgive such ignorance and unbelief!

In Mr. F's concluding remarks, he addresses himself to his ministering brethren thus, "you believe with Christ, that the soul may be lost. And that it is of such value that its loss cannot be compensated by the gain of the whole world."—In this passage, Mr. F. has shown himself to be grossly ignorant, or extremely wicked. Christ has never uttered a word which even favors the idea that the *soul* may be finally lost. The only passge which contains even the appearance of such an idea, is found in St. Matt. 16. 26. "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Did not Mr. F. know, that the Greek word rendered *soul* in this passage, is the same that is rendered *life* in the preceding verse? If he did not, he was grossly ignorant concerning this matter. If he did, he must have artfully presumed upon the ignorance of his hearers. It is easily perceived that this world would be worthless to one who should lose his natural life in obtaining it.

Mr. F. lays great stress upon the "sympathies, the zeal and diligence" of his ministering brethren. We doubt not their good feelings and good intentions, though we may regret their weakness and infirmity: but we strenuously object to the preposterous notion that these *preachers are better than the God that made us!* Preachers would do well to say less about their own grace and goodness, prompting them to powerful exertions and great sacrifices to save sinners; and speak more concerning the all-prevailing grace and unbounded goodness of our common Father in heaven. If these pious preachers would allow God to possess as much benevolence and zeal for the welfare of mankind, as they *profess;* they must admit that the most stubborn rebel against God that ever blackened his character with crime and infamy, shall be brought to bow submissively to the Prince of Peace, and humbly plead for the blessings of redeeming grace;—that the last son and daughter of affliction shall feel the consoling balm of divine love;—"*And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them,* shall say, *blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.*"! Rev. 5. 13.

ABSURD THEORY PRACTICALLY ILLUSTRATED.

Mr. Fauntleroy was executed in England for forgery on the 30th of Nov. last.

The following occurrence, we consider to be one of the most perfect, practical illustrations of the absurd doctrine of

substitution, or *vicarious suffering*, which has ever been furnished.

Those who believe in the doctrine of vicarious suffering, could not but perceive that the arguments of *Mr.* Angelini were conclusive according to their theory; they therefore concluded the man must be crazy!

ABSURDITY OF THE DOCTRINE OF A VICARIOUS SACRIFICE EXPOSED, BY A CASE IN POINT.

[*From a late London paper.*]

Mansion-House.——Edmund Angelini, professor of languages, and whose fracas with the Austrian Ambassador respecting the refusal of a passport has excited some curiosity, came before the Lord *Mayor*, and made a statement to the following effect: "*My* Lord, —He who has violated the law, ought to perish by the sword of justice—*Mr.* Fauntleroy ought to perish by the sword of justice. If, however, another take his place, I think justice ought to be satisfied: now I devote myself for *Mr.* Fauntleroy, I take upon myself his crime, and wish to die to save him; he is a father; he is a citizen; his life is useful; mine is a burden to the world. I am in good health; my mental faculties are unimpaired. I do not ask this in order to get my action spoken of, but I apply for it as a favor."

Mr. Angelini proceeded to support his request to die on the scaffold, with great energy of manner, and uncommon external manifestions of sincerity.

The Lord *Mayor* expressed his surprise at the application, and his doubts as to the soundness of the petitioner's faculties.

Mr. Angelini vehemently assured his Lordship of the perfect condition of his understanding. "Accordez moi cette grace," said he, "J'ai toute ma tete."

He was informed that it was contrary to all *justice*, and to all practice too (as a man of his education might have known,) that the life of an *innocent* person should be taken as a substitute for that of one who was *guilty*, however disposed the innocent person might be to make the sacrifice.

Mr. Angelini said, that there was a strong argument against that position in holy writ, from which it was plain to all believers, that our Saviour died as an atonement for the sins of others. He did not see why he should not be allowed to imitate that grand example. Upon being informed of the absurdity of his application, he became calmer, but he said he was very, extremely, willing to die. When asked whether he was the same person who was some time ago taken before a magistrate at *Marlborough*-street police office, he replied in the affirmative, but said that the charge was all wrong, that he was innocent, and that his innocence was proved. He also acknowledged that he had lived some time at Bath, but he declared that his character would bear the strictest investigation.

The following paragraph gives the finale of this singular application:

While these scenes were passsing, the Italian teacher of languages, Angelini, who on Friday applied to the Lord Mayor for permission to die for Mr. Fauntleroy, knocks at the door of Newgate, and introduced himself to the Ordinary, who was just going to administer the sacrament. He said he had come to take the place of the convict, as he was very anxious that that person's life should be saved, in consideration of his wife and family. The Ordinary remonstrated with him upon the absurdity of the application; but finding that the more objections were made, the more noisy the Italian became, he desired one of the officers to talk to him upon the subject. Angelini, after some expressions of regret at not being allowed to die on the scaffold, suddenly quitted the prison, into which he had gained admission upon the strength of the Lord Mayor's name.

REMARKS.

By the Editor of the Gospel Herald.

The doctrine of a vicarious sacrifice, or the substitution of the *innocent* to suffer punishment in the room and stead of the *guilty*, is fairly exposed in the above account, so that its admirers can see their favorite hypothesis in naked beauty, and observe the excellence of its proportions, and the symmetry of its parts. This Italian certainly is a rare character; and can prefer extraordinary claims to orthodoxy above all his compeers in absurdity of the Church of England, and of every other nation, kindred, tongue, and people.

"I," says this polemical prodigy, "*take upon myself his crimes.*" "He did not see why he should not be permitted to *imitate the grand example* found in the Scriptures!" The consistent Lord Mayor, (a good Churchman,) doubts the soundness of the man's faculties, because he wished to reduce to practice the most prominent article of his *own* creed! Surely, if this Italian is crazy, nine-tenths of the reli-

gious world are crazy also. Now this Lord Mayor and the Ordinary, reason well, while their creed is not specially in question, and pronounce that "contrary to all *justice* and *absurd*," which, in the Church, on the first day of every week, is declared to be harmoniously *consistent* and *just*, and worthy of the Divine Mind who conceived it!!!

We certainly live in a wonderful age, and are surrounded by wonderful people. Mankind now, can see absurdity and injustice plainly one day, and reject the same with abhorrence; and the next day be delighted with the excellence and perfection of that system which they from their inmost souls detest. Thus we see, that the religious creed of modern times, however well it may answer as a creed, to be brushed with sophistical arguments, in the pulpit, every week, would turn the world topsy-turvy were it reduced to practice, and outrage every rational and consistent principle. So mankind go on, self-condemned, deceived and deceiving; and falling, by thousands of thousands, plump into the ditch of orthodoxy. It is only on extraordinary occasions, when some *crazy* Italian presents himself, and offers, patriotically, to reduce their principles to practice, that they are roused from the slumber of absurdity; and only wake to utter a sentence of common sense, when they relapse again into the stupor of sanctified folly. Alas!

INDIAN SPEECH.

The Speech of Sagona Ha, which signifies the Keeper Awake, a Chief of the Seneca Nation of Indians, known by the white people, by the name of Red Jacket, in answer to a Speech of the Rev. Mr. Alexander, a Missionary, from the Missionary Society in New York, to that Nation, delivered at a Council, held at Buffalo-Creek, in May, 1811.

Brother, We listened to the talk you delivered to us from the council of *Black Coats** in New-York, We have fully considered your talk, and the offers you have made us, which we perfectly understand, and we return our answer to them, which we wish you also to understand. In making up our minds, we have looked back, and remembered what has been done in our days, and what our fathers have told us was done in old times.

Brother, Great numbers of Black Coats, have been among the Indians, and with sweet voices and smiling faces, have offered to teach them the religion of the white people. Our brethren in the east listened to them—turned from the religion of their fathers, and took up the religion of the white people. What good has it done? Are they more friendly one to another, than we are? No, brother, they are a divided people: we are united; they quarrel about religion; we live in love and friendship; they drink strong waters, have learnt how to cheat and practice all the vices of the white people which disgrace Indians, without imitating the virtues of the white people: Brother, if you are our well wisher, keep away and do not disturb us.

Brother, We do not worship the Great Spirit as the white people do, but we believe the forms of worship are indifferent to the Great Spirit; it is the homage of a sincere heart that pleases him, and we worship him in this manner.

Brother, You wish us to change our religion for yours; we like our religion, and do not want another. Our friends (pointing to Messrs. Granger, Parish and Taylor*) do us great good. They counsel us in our troubles, and tell us how to make ourselves comfortable. Our friends the Quakers do more than this—They give us ploughs, and instruct us how to use them. They tell us we are accountable beings, but do not say we must change our religion. We are satisfied with what they do.

Brother, For these reasons we cannot receive your offers; we have other things to do, and beg you to make your mind, easy, and not trouble us, lest our heads should be too much loaded, and by and by burst.

* The appellation given to Clergymen by the Indians.

* Mr. Granger is the agent of the United States for Indian affairs, and resides at Buffalo. Mr. Parish is the Indian interpreter: and Mr. Taylor is the agent in the Society of friends, for improving the condition of the Indians, and resides near the Allegany river.

IMPORTANT TO THE RELIGIOUS PUBLIC.

THE UNIVERSALIST.

The public are respectfully informed that a UNION of the *Rochester Magazine*, *Gospel Inquirer*, and *Herald of Salvation*,

has taken place, and that *one* paper, as a substitute for the *three*, will be henceforth published at Utica, under the title of

The Universalist.

As this new publication shall unite, in one focus, the literary and religious efforts of the former *three*, and be afforded for ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS, which is *only one half the former expense*, the Patrons of the MAGAZINE, INQUIRER and HERALD cannot fail to share in the general satisfaction, resulting from the measures which have been adopted by the Editors. Every reflecting mind will easily perceive the *advantages* arising from a combination of intellectual and pecuniary resources, and at once discover the *pre-eminence* of a paper, ably managed and liberally supported, over a number *circumscribed* both in means and circulation.

To the efforts of the former Editors will be added the co-operation of Br. S. R. Smith, which is esteemed a *valuable* acquisition; and, from the character of the former papers, it will easily be perceived, that the grand object of "THE UNIVERSALIST," will be the promulgation and defence of that *glorious Gospel of the grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men.*

The Editors have labored, hitherto, in the benevolent work, even to the injury of personal property, and are still disposed to sacrifice individual concerns to the interest of *common salvation*; let therefore a *philanthropic* and *enlightened* public, aid in the glorious enterprize, by affording that support to "THE UNIVERSALIST," which its claims to public patronage most justly demand.

"THE UNIVERSALIST," containing 16 octavo pages, will be published semi-monthly, at Utica, for ONE DOLLAR FIFTY CENTS *a year, paid* IN ADVANCE.

All who are disposed to patronize the work, will please to forward their subscriptions without delay, as no *numbers* will be issued without *payment.*

Persons wishing to encourage "THE UNIVERSALIST," can apply to *either* of the Editors, who will receive their subscriptions, and supply them with the numbers as soon as they are issued.

The Editors intend to issue the *first* number of "THE UNIVERSALIST" about the first of *March* next.

JOHN S. THOMPSON,
STEPHEN R. SMITH,
GEORGE B. LISHER.

January 1825.

OBITUARY.

DIED.—In this town, on the 6th inst. *Mrs. Mary Peck*, aged 54 years, wife of *Seth Peck* Esq.

Mrs. Peck has ever maintained an irreproachable character, and was a valuable member of society. For many years she has been a professor of religion, and invariably ornamented her profession by a godly life and conversation. Though a member of the Presbyterian Church, in good standing, she died in the soul-cheering faith of the final "restitution of all things." This precious faith, she deliberately embraced in the latest period of her life, and with a full conviction of her near approach to the grave. The consolations of the gospel of everlasting life, forsook her not in death; and her surviving partner and numerous friends will long tenderly cherish the remembrance of her worth. "Eccles. 7. 1." "A good name is better than precious ointment; and the day of *death*, than the day of one's birth." Chapt. 4 verse 2. "Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive."

In this village, on the 15th inst. *Mrs. Rebecca S. Farwell*, aged 31 years, consort of *Mr. James Farwell.*

In the death of this excellent woman, society has been deprived of one of its most valuable members, and her bereaved companion and afflicted family, have sustained an irreparable loss. Uniformly correct in her moral deportment, active and faithful in the performance of the respective duties of a *wife*, a *mother* and a *member* of community; *Mrs.* Farwell conciliated the affection and esteem of a numerous circle of acquaintances. While her body was rapidly going to decay, under the operation of a confirmed consumption, she retained her mental faculties in a remarkable degree: and though for nearly a year past she could speak only in a whisper, yet she would converse with composure upon the subject of her own dissolution and the grace of her Father in heaven. *Mrs.* Farwell was entirely free from a sectarian spirit, but possessed of the genuine spirit of universal benevolence. She had long been a believer in the universal grace and salvation of God. This faith consoled her last moments and smoothed the pillow of death. *While* virtue and excellence are esteemed, her memory shall not be effaced, but fondly cherished

in everlasting remembrance. Eccles. 12, 6. 7. "Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern; then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

POETRY.

[For the Herald.]

ODE TO SINCERITY.

Celestial Fair! Daughter of truth and love,
O sweet *Sincerity!* Thou rare inhabitant
Of earth: why thus a stranger here? Return
Once more, and re-illume the world; and mortals
Deign to bless, with thy all-cheering rays:
Return, and make thy home once more within
The mind, and grace the heart of man. O come,
And with thy downy hands, wipe off the tear,
That trembling waits, in the averted eye
Of tender sensibility.
*W*hy dost thou roam so long? *W*hy soarest thou,
So far above the ken of beings, stiled
Intelligent? Has falsehood gain'd the victory
Entire; and like "a strong man arm'd," disrob'd
Thy laurel'd brow, of honors all thy own,
To deck his rueful pate, and screen his dark
Hypocrisy? Alas, alas! No marvel -
Then thou'st veil'd thy face with frowns and bid adieu
To scenes where treach'ry presides, and wears
Thy mask to hide its foul deformity :—
No wonder then, that man distrusts his fellow
Man; and devastation, death and woe
Depopulate the world; and desolation
Spreads its pestilence abroad, like a contagious
Dire disease. Hence 'tis, the orphan sorrowing
Finds forgotten, void, each promise made, and
Mourns his early loss. Hence the sweet inspir'd
Hope, that cheers the widow's solitary
Breast, and moves her feeble pulse to chaste
Endeavors, false and vain. *A*nd age, and pale
Infirmity are by experience taught
A lesson; to their sorrow too, when they
*A*nticipate the extended hand to aid their
Tottering steps; and find too late 'tis specious
*M*ockery and prophane.
Hence the pious matron mourns the blighted
Plants of young simplicity, nurs'd by her
Fostering hand, and fond maternal vigilance
And care; tender shoots of earliest love;
Just budding fresh to bloom, untimely poison'd
*A*t the root; e'er her proud hopes were realiz'd
In the expanded blossom; they're blasted
*W*ith the beauteous flower, together
Prostrate fallen, to rise no more for ever.
Hence the pale, wan, feeble female, once the
Pride of friends, the boast of her acquaintance.
Of dear society, the ornament and grace,
The life of circles, chosen and select;—
Sits now, a pensive statue of *insincerity*
In man; a melancholy monument
Of man's deception and woman's imbecility.
Lo! how her faithful and confiding bosom
Bleeds, with disappointment's darts, and trust
*A*bus'd.—Behold her tears, her sighs, her sunken
Eye and heaving breast, her bursting heart, her
Once lovely, but now emaciated form;
Her trembling foot-steps downward tending to
The grave: her last asylum, and her only
Sure and safe retreat.
Return, O! sweet sincerity, celestial
Fair, return—with all thy heavenly train,
With thy divine attendance come, and
Peaceable possession take, of thy own
Empire man. ZEPHIRA.

HYMENEAL.

MARRIED—On the 22d inst. in Rutland, by the Rev. P. Morse, Rev. Ezekiel W. Robbins to Miss Betsey Heicox, daughter of David Heicox, Esq.

TO OUR PATRONS.

Mr. John Fay is appointed general agent for the collection of monies due, both for the first and second volumes of the Herald. Local agents as well as individual subscibers, are therefore requested to make payment to him.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT WATERTOWN N. Y. AT $1 00 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE. W. WOODWARD, PRINTER.

Having been enabled to complete the second volume of the Herald, we cannot be unmindful of our obligations of unfeigned gratitude to the kind Parent of nature and God of all grace, for the entire success with which he has crowned our humble, well designed exertions to promote and extend the knowledge of his impartial grace amongst our fellow men. At the commencement of our publication, its success was entirely problematical. No work of the kind had ever been established in this part of our country. The doctrine of universal grace was very little known, and was most strenuously opposed by the *scribes* and *pharisees* of this generation. However imperfect our labors in this publication may have been, we are fully convinced that this work has been instrumental in bringing many to the knowledge of God, and the enjoyment of his unfailing grace. Such has been our success in this glorious undertaking, that even our enemies have been compelled to be at peace with us. Such has been our consciousness of rectitude, that while laboring to delineate the true character of God, and illustrate the infinity of his wisdom, power and love, and the consequent glorious issue of the divine mission of Jesus, in the purification and everlasting felicity of a sinful world, that we have richly enjoyed

"*What nothing earthly gives or can destroy,*
The soul's calm sunshine and the heartfelt joy."

In this ever-varying world, where plans are suggested, matured and executed; where exists a constant collision of human opinions, interests and feelings; where individuals and empires rise and fall; where an endless variety of events transpire, all revolutions conspire to carry on to their completion the grand, glorious and gracious purposes of the Almighty. Light will shine in spite of all the powers of darkness. Truth will finally prevail. The knowledge of the Lord will fill the earth as the waters cover the face of the mighty deep. A prospective vision of the triumphs and glories of the Redeemer's kingdom, throughout all future generations of mankind, fills the heart of benevolence with inexpressible joy, and enables us to exclaim—

"Behold the measure of the promise fill'd;
See Salem built, the labor of a God!
Bright as a sun the sacred city shines;
All kingdoms and all princes of the earth
Flock to that light; the glory of all lands
Flows into her; unbounded is her joy,
And endless her increase."

"*Thus heaven-ward all things tend.* For all were once
Perfect, *and all must be at length restored.*
So God has greatly purposed; who would else
In his dishonored works, *himself endure*
Dishonor, and be wronged without redress"!

REPLY TO A COMMUNICATION SIGNED "ZUINGLUS," CONTAINED ON THE 45TH AND 46TH PAGES OF OUR PRESENT VOLUME.

In the 21st No. of the first volume of the Herald, the first communication of "Zuinglus is inserted. In that communication, "Z" took up a subject which had been relinquished by another correspondent, as he said, "not with a view to provoke controversy, but to elicit some further information." Our positions that Universalism holds out an adequate discouragement to sin; and that punishment is designed for the *good* of those who are punished, were objected to by "Z." on the ground that if the latter of the above positions were true, "the state of the sinner while suffering the penalty, (of his crime) is more eligible than it would have been, had he have continued upright." "Z." also contended that we denied the doctrine of *forgiveness*, because we maintained that the forgiveness of a sinner does not deliver him from the *just* punishment of his wickedness.

In reply to the first communication of "Z." we stated that "if we should fail (to remove the objections of our opponent) "we had a right to expect that he would invalidate some of our principal arguments." We showed that the erroneous view of forgiveness against which we contended, is founded on the *supposed opposition* of the *justice* and *mercy* of God. We showed "Z." that he had made a *mistake* in his statement concerning what we had taken for *granted*. We proved by direct argument, that punishment is intended for the *good* of the punished, and adduced the most positive testimony from the scriptures in support of this position. We showed from "Z.'s" own expressions that he represents sin as being productive of *present* happiness: this idea we contrasted with the language of scripture, "There is no peace to the wicked." We showed the mistake of "Z." in supposing that our argument precluded *forgiveness*,

in everlasting remembrance. Eccles. 12, 6. 7. "Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern; then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

POETRY.

[For the Herald.]

ODE TO SINCERITY.

Celestial Fair! Daughter of truth and love,
O sweet *Sincerity!* Thou rare inhabitant
Of earth: why thus a stranger here? Return
Once more, and re-illume the world; and mortals
Deign to bless, with thy all-cheering rays:
Return, and make thy home once more within
The mind, and grace the heart of man. O come,
And with thy downy hands, wipe off the tear,
That trembling waits, in the averted eye
Of tender sensibility.
*W*hy dost thou roam so long? *W*hy soarest thou,
So far above the ken of beings, stiled
Intelligent? Has falsehood gain'd the victory
Entire; and like "a strong man arm'd," disrob'd
Thy laurel'd brow, of honors all thy own,
To deck his rueful pate, and screen his dark
Hypocrisy? Alas, alas! No marvel -
Then thou'st veil'd thy face with frowns and bid adieu
To scenes where treach'ry presides, and wears
Thy mask to hide its foul deformity:—
No wonder then, that man distrusts his fellow
Man; and devastation, death and woe
Depopulate the world; and desolation
Spreads its pestilence abroad, like a contagious
Dire disease. Hence 'tis, the orphan sorrowing
Finds forgotten, void, each promise made, and
Mourns his early loss. Hence the sweet inspir'd
Hope, that cheers the widow's solitary
Breast, and moves her feeble pulse to chaste
Endeavors, false and vain. *A*nd age, and pale
Infirmity are by experience taught
A lesson; to their sorrow too, when they
*A*nticipate the extended hand to aid their
Tottering steps; and find too late 'tis specious
*M*ockery and prophane.
Hence the pious matron mourns the blighted
Plants of young simplicity, nurs'd by her
Fostering hand, and fond maternal vigilance.
And care; tender shoots of earliest love;
Just budding fresh to bloom, untimely poison'd
*A*t the root; e'er her proud hopes were realiz'd
In the expanded blossom; they're blasted
*W*ith the beauteous flower, together
Prostrate fallen, to rise no more for ever.
Hence the pale, wan, feeble female, once the
Pride of friends, the boast of her acquaintance,
Of dear society, the ornament and grace,
The life of circles, chosen and select;—
Sits now, a pensive statue of *insincerity*
In man; a melancholy monument
Of man's deception and woman's imbecility.
Lo! how her faithful and confiding bosom
Bleeds, with disappointment's darts, and trust
*A*bus'd.—Behold her tears, her sighs, her sunken
Eye and heaving breast, her bursting heart, her
Once lovely, but now emaciated form;
Her trembling foot-steps downward tending to
The grave: her last asylum, and her only
Sure and safe retreat.
Return, O! sweet sincerity, celestial
Fair, return—with all thy heavenly train,
With thy divine attendance come, and
Peaceable possession take, of thy own
Empire man. ZEPHIRA.

HYMENEAL.

MARRIED—On the 22d inst. in Rutland, by the Rev. P. Morse, Rev. Ezekiel W. Robbins to Miss Betsey Heicox, daughter of David Heicox, Esq.

TO OUR PATRONS.

Mr. John Fay is appointed general agent for the collection of monies due, both for the first and second volumes of the Herald. Local agents as well as individual subscibers, are therefore requested to make payment to him.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT WATERTOWN N. Y. AT $1 00 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE. W. WOODWARD, PRINTER.

Having been enabled to complete the second volume of the Herald, we cannot be unmindful of our obligations of unfeigned gratitude to the kind Parent of nature and God of all grace, for the entire success with which he has crowned our humble, well designed exertions to promote and extend the knowledge of his impartial grace amongst our fellow men. At the commencement of our publication, its success was entirely problematical. No work of the kind had ever been established in this part of our country. The doctrine of universal grace was very little known, and was most strenuously opposed by the *scribes* and *pharisees* of this generation. However imperfect our labors in this publication may have been, we are fully convinced that this work has been instrumental in bringing many to the knowledge of God, and the enjoyment of his unfailing grace. Such has been our success in this glorious undertaking, that even our enemies have been compelled to be at peace with us. Such has been our consciousness of rectitude, that while laboring to delineate the true character of God, and illustrate the infinity of his wisdom, power and love, and the consequent glorious issue of the divine mission of Jesus, in the purification and everlasting felicity of a sinful world, that we have richly enjoyed

"*What nothing earthly gives or can destroy,*
The soul's calm sunshine and the heartfelt joy."

In this ever-varying world, where plans are suggested, matured and executed; where exists a constant collision of human opinions, interests and feelings; where individuals and empires rise and fall; where an endless variety of events transpire, all revolutions conspire to carry on to their completion the grand, glorious and gracious purposes of the Almighty. Light will shine in spite of all the powers of darkness. Truth will finally prevail. The knowledge of the Lord will fill the earth as the waters cover the face of the mighty deep. A prospective vision of the triumphs and glories of the Redeemer's kingdom, throughout all future generations of mankind, fills the heart of benevolence with inexpressible joy, and enables us to exclaim—

"Behold the measure of the promise fill'd;
See Salem built, the labor of a God!
Bright as a sun the sacred city shines;
All kingdoms and all princes of the earth
Flock to that light; the glory of all lands
Flows into her; unbounded is her joy,
And endless her increase."

"*Thus heaven-ward all things tend.* For all were once
Perfect, *and all must be at length restored.*
So God has greatly purposed; who would else
In his dishonored works, *himself endure*
Dishonor, and be wronged without redress"!

REPLY TO A COMMUNICATION SIGNED "ZUINGLUS," CONTAINED ON THE 45TH AND 46TH PAGES OF OUR PRESENT VOLUME.

In the 21st No. of the first volume of the Herald, the first communication of "Zuinglus is inserted. In that communication, "Z" took up a subject which had been relinquished by another correspondent, as he said, "not with a view to provoke controversy, but to elicit some further information." Our positions that Universalism holds out an adequate discouragement to sin; and that punishment is designed for the *good* of those who are punished, were objected to by "Z." on the ground that if the latter of the above positions were true, "the state of the sinner while suffering the penalty, (of his crime) is more eligible than it would have been, had he have continued upright." "Z." also contended that we denied the doctrine of *forgiveness*, because we maintained that the forgiveness of a sinner does not deliver him from the *just* punishment of his wickedness.

In reply to the first communication of "Z." we stated that "if we should fail (to remove the objections of our opponent) "we had a right to expect that he would invalidate some of our principal arguments." We showed that the erroneous view of forgiveness against which we contended, is founded on the *supposed opposition* of the *justice* and *mercy* of God. We showed "Z." that he had made a *mistake* in his statement concerning what we had taken for *granted*. We proved by direct argument, that punishment is intended for the *good* of the punished, and adduced the most positive testimony from the scriptures in support of this position. We showed from "Z.'s" own expressions that he represents sin as being productive of *present* happiness: this idea we contrasted with the language of scripture, "There is no peace to the wicked." We showed the mistake of "Z." in supposing that our argument precluded *forgiveness*,

and explicitly stated that our view of forgiveness does not prevent "a just recompense of reward." We also referred to the good sense of "Z." to lead to the conclusion that it does not afford an adequate discouragement to sin, to assure mankind that they can transgress the divine law with *impunity;* that they will *not* be punished as they deserve; that *forgiveness* delivers them from the hand of *justice;* and though they deserve an eternal hell, yet God will give them the felicity of heaven at the expense of his truth. In reply to all these arguments, what has "Zuinglus" said? The reader will perceive by reference to his last communication. It seems "Z." felt in duty bound, either to agree with us, or "give a reason" why he did not. We think it would have done more honor to the understanding and the heart of "Z." to admit the correctness and truth of our positions and arguments, than to make the "objections" furnished in his last production. He may, however, be sincere, though we think somewhat blinded by prejudice.

The great difficulty with our correspondent seems to be, *to reconcile the existence of evil with the character of God.* He says, "the Editor seems to be confident that he has proved, by the force of reasoning, that punishment is *good* (results in good) to the sufferer of it. The mode of reasoning, however, by which it is done, it is conceived, would prove quite as clearly, that sin could exist." "Z." has not attempted to show that our reasoning was inconclusive, he merely observes that it "would prove quite as clearly, *that sin could exist*"! Very well.—Sin does exist; and if our arguments can be justly applied to prove *two* important truths, instead of *one*, this application would by no means destroy the validity of those arguments. We presume "Z." made a mistake in the statement just commented upon; and said our mode of reasoning would prove sin could exist, when he meant to say, sin could *not* exist.—Wishing to show him all possible candor, we will examine his position as we suppose he intended to state it. He says, "to say that it (sin) was introduced to promote good, would be a glaring solecism." That sin does actually exist, must be universally admitted. For what purpose was it introduced? If it were introduced, or permitted, to effect never-ending injury and evil to man, then the being who introduced it for this purpose, or who permitted it with a knowledge of the consequences, (having always possessed the power to prevent it) must necessarily be a *wicked being!* So far, therefore, from being a *solecism*, the idea that God introduced sin, or permitted it to be introduced for the purpose of effecting some important, final good, is the only one which can be reconciled with the character of a God of infinite perfection. "Z." says, "if it should be objected that a temporary existence of evil would enlarge the sources of good, and thus ultimately be productive of it, we may say, that if God be infinitely benevolent, he would design the greatest possible good; if omniscient, he would devise the best means to promote it; and if omnipotent, he would exert his energies to carry those means into effect." The *infinite benevolence*, united with the *omniscience* and *omnipotence* of God, furnish indubitable evidence that he does desire, and will effect *the greatest possible good* of the intelligent universe; and consequently that *evil* and *misery* cannot exist *ad infinitum*. These glorious attributes of the adorable Creator, afford ground for the consolatory faith, that he can and will bring light out of darkness, and final good out of partial and temporary *evil*, and thereby accomplish the greatest possible *good*, in the final salvation and everlasting happiness of all intelligent, created beings. We have nothing to do with the "unrevealed counsels of God." Our object is to enable "Z." and others to understand what God has revealed.

In "Z."s first communication, he lays it down as an inference from our position and arguments, that "the state of a sinner, while suffering the penalty (of his crimes) is more eligible than it would have been, had he continued upright." After our reply to this particular, he says, "whether the state of a sinner while suffering the penalty of his sins, is more eligible than that of uprightness *is of no importance;* but the conclusion that his condition is, on the whole, more eligible, seems to be irresistible, except we admit that there is an intermediate state between the commission of sin and the punishment for it." This admission would have no possible bearing upon the question whether the condition of the sinner be, on the whole, more eligible, &c. for the answer to this question must depend upon the *nature*, *duration*, and *consequences* of the punishment inflict-

ed. *We* may therefore admit, or deny that there is such intermediate state, without affecting the subject of our discussion. But what kind of an intermediate state would "Z." have between the commission of sin and the punishment of it? Speaking of such state, "Z." says, "*in which the sinner* SUFFERS the sting of guilt," &c. A state in which the sinner *suffers* for his crimes, would not be a state *between* the commission and the punishment of sin; but it would be a state of *punishment*.—"Z." thinks "the punishment that Universalists talk of, is little understood." For correct knowledge on this subject, we refer "Z." to his own *experience*. Universalists think there is a vast difference between *fact* and *fiction*. *We* do not, like some sharp sighted mortals, pretend to *understand* the things of an *invisible* world, better than we do the transpiring events of time. The vengeance of (*aionian*, age-lasting) eternal fire cannot be endured unconsciously; and when people are *tormented* day and night, they will be certain to know it.

The expression made in "Z's." first communication, which we called *unguarded* certainly represents sin to be productive of happiness. This statement "Z." thinks was not "exceptionable in any point of view." "Z." says, "The scripture certainly says, 'there is no peace to the wicked,' but I am not aware that it says there is no gratification to them, when they commit crime." No position can be found in the scriptures more clearly stated than that sin produces misery. If, then, there be an animal *gratification* which produces mental misery; it follows that no sinful gratification can be "so great as to stifle all feeling of compunction," and all consciousness of guilt. Whatever the searing of the conscience as with a hot iron, may mean; it cannot mean that there is peace and happiness to the wicked, notwithstanding the searing of his conscience. Those whose consciences are seared are evidently deprived of the enjoyment produced by virtue and obedience to the divine precepts.

In his fifth paragraph "Z." undertakes to show that he was correct in a certain particular, concerning which we had said, "surely he is beside himself; surely he is looking for a kind of forgiveness that he never can obtain." In order to present the absurdity of our correspondent in such a point of light, that even he cannot but perceive it; we will state our position with his remarks upon it. In No. 12 of our first volume, after having exhibited the scripture doctrine of salvation, and proved that it does not deliver the sinner from just punishment; we arrived at the following conclusion, viz. "Either *forgiveness* must be explained and understood in such a manner as to admit of the sinner's receiving *all* the punishment he *justly* deserves, or we must suppose that the sinner is saved in *violation* of justice, and that the numerous passages of scripture which declare "God shall render to every man according to his works," *are not true!*" We then showed that sinners are *forgiven* by being made the subjects of divine grace, after having been subjected to the righteous discipline of the best of Beings. But they cannot be so forgiven any sin as to prevent their receiving the *good* intended for them, or *violate* immutable, eternal justice, or invalidate the scriptures of truth. Such was our position, We never said, *forgiveness* "can never be exercised without direful effects." We never said that the *good* intended for sinners was their *punishment*." On the contrary, we showed that forgiveness can be exercised, though it delivers not from the retributions of *justice;* and that the *good* received by sinners, *succeeds* their punishment, and is enjoyed after their sufferings have ended, according to the testimony of the apostle, who says that though chastening for the present seemeth to be *grievous* yet *afterwards* it worketh the peaceable fruits of righteousness. *W*hen therefore "Z." infers that by the final *good* of the sinner, we meant his punishment, he is "beside himself;" and when he says sinners "cannot be forgiven at all," because they cannot be so forgiven as to *violate* eternal justice and invalidate the scriptures of truth; he certainly is looking for a kind of forgiveness which he never can receive. It is therefore not "preposterous" to say "Z." is *mistaken*, although he may be in the possession of "rational faculties." "Z." says, "My meaning was, that an exercise of any description towards a sinner after he had been punished as much as he deserved, was not forgiveness of the sins for which he suffered, according to the legitimate use of language." *We* have shown in our former communications on this subject, (unless we are much mistaken,) that the exercise of divine mercy towards a sinner, notwith-

standing his being *punished as much as he deserves* is *forgiveness* of his sins, *according to the scripture doctrine of forgiveness.* This opinion is founded on the harmony of *justice* and *mercy.* If justice oppose mercy, or *vice versa*, then God must be eternally at war with himself! If justice and mercy *harmonise*, then justice will not prevent the exercise of mercy; and mercy will not prevent the exercise of strict justice. *We* request "Z." to re-examine our arguments on this subject.

"Z." says, "It is hard to conceive that spiritual blessings can be bestowed on man but in and through reconciliation to God." *Who* disputes this? He further says, "If the sinner at the expiration of his punishment is wanting in this point" (reconciliation) "in what does the good of it" (his punishment) "consist?" Answer. the sinner's punishment can never end till he becomes *reconciled.* If the sinner be eternally unreconciled, he could never receive any spiritual good. The good of punishment consists in the production of reconciliation and obedience. Again, "Z." says, "Or if he is reconciled how does he stand in need of forgiveness?" Answer; whenever the sinner is reconciled, he is reconciled by divine forgiveness or mercy; therefore he never can be reconciled but by divine forgiveness. Again, "Z." says, "Or if punishment produces reconciliation, and a state of reconciliation is forgiveness, then punishment and reconciliation, are inseparably connected which leaves no occasion for the exercise of forgiveness." What the writer of the above sentence was thinking about when he wrote it, cannot now be determined; but certainly he did not understand his subject, or did not write what he intended, otherwise he would have seen the contradiction contained in his supposition. He says, "and a state of reconciliation *is* forgiveness, then punishment and *reconciliation*" (*forgiveness*, according to "Z.") "are inseparably connected, which leaves no occasion for the exercise of *forgiveness;*" i. e. punishment and *forgiveness* (*reconciliation* and *forgiveness being the same* according to "Z.") are inseparably connected and this leaves no occasion for the exercise of *forgiveness!!!* A state of reconciliation, holiness and happiness is the result of divine mercy or forgiveness. "Z." says, "Or if that blessing is bestowed subsequently upon him, it is a sovereign act of God, with which his punishment has no more connexion, than man's original gift of uprightness had." What "blessing," "bestowed subsequently" to what event are particulars which require some explanation. If by that "blessing," "Z." meant reconciliation or forgiveness; we may admit that it was "a sovereign act of God." It may also be admitted that *punishment* is "a sovereign act of God." All the acts of God originate in infinite love, and are directed by unerring wisdom — His justice and his mercy exist in the most intimate "connexion" imaginable. The "original uprightness" of man, we consider to be similar to the *original uprightness* of every individual throughout all generations of mankind.

Note.—When "Z's." second communication was published, a reply was promised. We have had particular reasons for so long delay.

TO OUR PATRONS AND THE PUBLIC.

Our readers must have observed the notice contained in our last, concerning the *union* of three religious publications. To this important subject, we earnestly solicit the serious attention of every friend of gospel truth. The great utility of religious, periodical works has been practically demonstrated. It is confidently hoped that this *union* will be the means of establishing a valuable paper upon a permanent basis. Knowing that this part of our country requires a publication of the kind, we should be very unwilling to discontinue the Herald; were it not for the proposed commencement of a new, and probably superior work to succeed it. Our present subscribers and all friends of truth and free inquiry are respectfully invited to patronize "THE UNIVELSALIST;" which will be printed at Utica, according to the notice contained in our last.

The Editor of the Herald will receive subscriptions for "*The Universalist;*" but no Numbers will be issued without *payment in advance.*

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

As the present No. closes this volume of the Herald, it becomes necessary to apprize our *delinquent* subscribers, that the payment for their papers is *indispensable* to their observance of that excellent rule which teaches mankind "TO DO JUSTLY," to each other. Those at a distance can transmit the money by mail. Those in this vicinity may make returns to the Editor, or to Mr. John Fay, to whom all remittances must be made.